

REMARKS

We are in receipt of the Office Action dated November 7, 2003, and the following remarks are made in light thereof.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 20-22 and 26-34 are pending in the application. Pursuant to the Office Action, claims 4, 5, 7-10 and 29-34 are allowed. Claims 1-3, 20-22 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The examiner contends that, with respect to claims 1, 20 and 26, one cannot tell which face of the pixel electrode is the first face and which is the second face.

Applicant believes that the identification of the first and second faces is clear by reference to Figs. 3, 7, 8A and 8B. Assuming that the main face of the pixel electrode is 258 (in Fig. 7), the first face is 251, which extends along the scanning line 257A. The second face is 256A, which is adjacent to an intersection between the scanning line 257A and the single line 262B. Further, the first face 251 is closer to the opposed electrode 301 than the main face 258, as shown in a cross-sectional view taken along D-D' in Fig. 8B. In addition, the second face 256A is closer to the opposed electrode 301 than the first face 251 as shown in the cross-sectional view taken along C-C' in Fig. 8A.



Accordingly, applicant believes that there is enablement with respect to the rejected claims and that, as such, all the claims in the application are in condition for allowance.

The examiner has also objected to the title to the invention as not being descriptive. Accordingly, the applicant has amended the title as indicated above.

Based upon the foregoing, applicant respectfully request the examiner to reconsider and allow the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen B. Heller
Registration No. 30,181

COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street - #2850
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 236-8500